

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-13 and 15-30 were presented for examination.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-13 and 15-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements.

Allowable subject matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication that claims 1-13 and 15-30 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Applicant amended claim 1 to clearly describe the cascaded relationships of the routing means, the resource allocation means, and the provisioning means. The basic functions, related to self-governance, of each stratum in the multi-stratum control system are described in amended claim 1. A specific output “resource allocation requirements” of the routing means triggers the self-governance function of the resource allocation means. A specific output “resource augmentation requirements” of the resource allocation means triggers the self-governance function of the provisioning means.

The routing indices and resource allocation indices of claims 2 and 9, respectively, are introduced in amended claim 1. Claims 2 and 9 are therefore cancelled. Claims depending on claims 2 or 9 are amended to depend on claim 1.

Claim 5 is amended to clearly define the route-depth parameter as described on page 19, lines 17-28, of the specification.

Claim 6 is amended to clearly describe the constituent-traffic indicator as described on page 16, lines 1-12, and page 20, lines 5-14, of the specification.

Claim 7 is amended to clearly describe the use of a routing-index threshold. The added limitations are described in the specification on page 19-line 29, to page 20-line 2, of the specification.

Claim 13 has been cancelled.

Claim 15 is amended to include definitions of primary and secondary traffic corresponding to FIG. 7 and the relevant description in the specification (page 20, lines 5-14).

Original claim 17 provides exemplary realizations of the routing means, resource allocation means, and provisioning means. Claim 17 is amended to further relate the exemplary realizations to structural elements of the network. The “routing means” is specifically defined as “a plurality of edge controllers”, the “resource allocation means” is specifically defined as a “plurality of core controllers”, and the “provisioning means” is specifically defined as a “network controller” (page 10, lines 17-21, of the specification).

Claim 21 is amended to provide further details of the routing function, the resource allocation function, and the network provisioning function. Amended claim 21 clearly describes the interdependence of the three functions: the routing function produces resource allocation requirements which are used in the resource allocation function to determine resource augmentation requirements, which are – in turn – used in the network-provisioning function to determine resource installation requirements.

Claims 22-30 have been amended to improve clarity. In particular, claim 26 is amended to clearly define the term “configuring network resources” as “rearrangement of allocated transport resources” as described in the specification page 29, lines 7-12.

All claims dependent from claim 1 are amended to replace “A system according to” with “The system according to”, and all claims depending from claim 21 are amended to replace “A method according to” with “The method according to.”

Conclusion

Claims 1, 3-8, 10-12, and 15-30 have been amended and claims 2, 9, and 13 are cancelled. No new material has been added.

Applicant has made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Lindsay G. McGuinness, Applicant's Attorney at 978-264-6664, extension 304, so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

In view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

March 28, 2007

/Lindsay G. McGuinness/
Lindsay G. McGuinness

Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
McGuinness & Manaras LLP
125 Nagog Park
Acton, MA 01720
(978) 264-6664

Docket No. 123-021